

Laura Vartain Horn (SBN 258485)  
**KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**  
555 California Street, Suite 2700  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 439-1625  
[laura.vartain@kirkland.com](mailto:laura.vartain@kirkland.com)

Allison M. Brown (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
**KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**  
2005 Market Street, Suite 1000  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 268-5000  
alli.brown@kirkland.com

Christopher V. Cotton (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
**SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP**  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, MO 64108  
Telephone: (816) 474-6550  
ccotton@shb.com

*Attorneys for Defendants*  
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC,  
And RASIER-CA, LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT  
LITIGATION

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB (LJC)

## This Document Relates to:

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO CHANGE TIME  
TO COMPLY WITH COURT'S ORDER  
CONCERNING NON-BONA-FIDE  
RECEIPTS**

*Jane Doe LS 333 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.* Case No. 3:23-cv-05930-CRB

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer  
Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor

*Jane Doe LS 397 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.* Case No. 3:24-cv-05864-CRB

DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO CHANGE TIME TO COMPLY WITH  
COURT'S ORDER CONCERNING NON-BONA-FIDE  
RECEIPTS

1 Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Raiser, LLC, and Raiser-CA, LLC (collectively, “Uber” or  
 2 “Defendants”) respectively oppose Plaintiffs’ Motion to Change Time to Comply with Court’s Order  
 3 Concerning Non-Bona Fide Receipts (ECF 3904).

4 **ARGUMENT**

5 The Levin Simes law firm has long known about issues with the receipts provided by *Jane Doe*  
 6 *LS 333* (MDL ID 1194) and *Jane Doe LS 397* (MDL ID 2350). In February 2024 and September 2024,  
 7 the Levin Simes firm served the non-bona-fide receipts at issue. Cotton Decl. ¶¶2-3. In May 2024 and  
 8 March 2025, Uber provided Defendant Fact Sheets indicating that Uber could not locate ride receipts that  
 9 correspond to these Plaintiffs’ allegations. Cotton Decl. ¶¶4-5. The non-bona-fide receipts were again  
 10 discussed in a letter to the Levin Simes firm on July 22, 2025, and on a meet and confer call with the firm  
 11 on July 25, 2025 – well before the current JCCP trial started. ECF 3604.

12 In July 2025, similar issues were raised with respect to 19 other Plaintiffs that likewise submitted  
 13 non-bona-fide receipts. *Id.* Counsel for those other Plaintiffs did not dispute that the receipts submitted  
 14 by their clients are inauthentic. Only Levin Simes asserted that “[b]oth Plaintiffs assure us their receipts  
 15 are authentic.” ECF 3771 at 2. Levin Simes did not provide any signed declarations, from themselves or  
 16 their clients, nor did they attempt to explain the discrepancies identified in Uber’s original Motion (ECF  
 17 3604). Today, over a year after Uber served the Defendant Fact Sheet for MDL ID 1194 and six months  
 18 since Uber served the Defendant Fact Sheet for MDL ID 2350, and almost two months after the parties’  
 19 meet and confer call, Levin Simes has not come forward with any explanation for these non-bona-fide  
 20 receipts.

21 On September 9, 2025, this Court ordered Plaintiffs with MDL IDs 1194 and 2350 to “(1) produce  
 22 native versions of their receipts, in accordance with the parties’ agreed upon ESI Protocol (ECF 524),  
 23 including all available metadata outlined in Appendix 2; (2) produce within 14 days of this Order any  
 24 documents and communications relating to the production of their ride receipts, the generation of their  
 25 receipts, and/or the website ‘Makereceipt.com’; and (3) submit within 30 days to a deposition not to  
 26 exceed 3 hours relating to the authenticity of their receipts.” ECF 3876. The next day, on September 10,  
 27 counsel for Defendants asked the Levin Simes firm to provide each Plaintiff’s availability for a deposition

1 between September 26-29 and October 6-9. *See* Cotton Decl. ¶6. The Levin Simes firm did not respond  
 2 to that request, so counsel for Defendants followed up with respect to deposition scheduling on September  
 3 12. *Id.* In response, the Levin Simes firm requested an extension of the deadlines set by the Court. *Id.*  
 4 Defendants did not agree to the requested extension. *Id.*

5 The Defendant Fact Sheets relating to the non-bona-fide receipts were served long ago (as far back  
 6 as May 2024), and the parties met and conferred back in July 2025. The Levin Simes firm has taken no  
 7 action to resolve these issues over the course of that time. Defendants have proposed several deposition  
 8 dates that would comply with this Court's September 9 Order, including dates after September 25, which  
 9 Plaintiffs acknowledge is when the JCCP trial is scheduled to conclude. In the interim, Plaintiffs should  
 10 produce the documents that the Court ordered to be produced. Bona fide ride receipts were due to be  
 11 produced long ago pursuant to PTO 5. ECF 175. The trial of a JCCP case does not excuse Plaintiffs in  
 12 this MDL from complying with Court orders – particularly where their actions implicate the integrity of  
 13 our judicial system.

#### 14 CONCLUSION

15 Plaintiffs with MDL IDs 1194 and 2350 have submitted non-bona-fide receipts. The JCCP trial  
 16 that is scheduled to conclude on September 25, 2025, does not justify extending the deadlines set by the  
 17 Court in its September 9, 2025 Order. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Motion to Change Time to Comply with  
 18 the Court's Order Concerning Non-Bona-Fide receipts should be denied.

19 Dated: September 15, 2025

20 Respectfully submitted,

21 

22 By:

23 Christopher V. Cotton (admitted *Pro Hac  
Vice*)  
**24 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.**  
 2555 Grand Blvd.  
 25 Kansas City, MO 64108  
 Telephone: (816) 474-6550  
 ccotton@shb.com

26 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
 27 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
 RASIER, LLC; and RASIER-CA, LLC